

82-25042

REMARKS OF WILLIAM J. CASEY
DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

TO

REPUBLICANS ABROAD

WASHINGTON, D. C.

23 MARCH 1982

Totell Estimate

APPROVED FOR RELEASE ☐ DATE: 03-Dec-2008

57 844

THE AMERICAN INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

I am happy to be here tonight for this reunion with all you Republicans Abroad.

I thought it was nice of Newsweek to advertise this little meeting in its Periscope section last week.

In CIA language, they took a clandestine and unattributed shot at me by having one of those anonymous White House aides declare it outrageous for me to speak at a political fundraiser. I want to announce this evening a thousand dollar reward for information establishing the existence and leading to the identification of that whipper-snapper in the White House, who is alleged to have told Newsweek that it is outrageous for me to speak to you tonight. ~~I want to find out why he gave that information to Newsweek and didn't have the courtesy or the courage to tell me.~~

Also, I'd like to ask you to pass the word to Democrats Abroad that I have some things to say that might be interesting and useful to them. You can tell them I'm available at the same speaking fee Dick Richards is paying me tonight.

I have looked forward to this evening as a social occasion which would give me a chance to visit a lot of old friends. Looking around the room, it more than meets my expectations even if I couldn't recall a name or two.

I'm John Lord O'Brien, can you remember your name?

I greatly enjoyed my meetings with Republicans Abroad in London and

Paris during 1980 and it's nice to have all of you here in Washington. Washington is a very pleasant place|even if it is hard to figure out|from day to day|where you are and where you're going. It reminds me of the old story about Oliver Wendell Holmes late in his distinguished career on the Supreme Court. Holmes found himself on a train. Confronted by the conductor, he couldn't find his ticket. Recognizing the distinguished jurist, however, the conductor told him not to worry. He could just send in his ticket when he found it. Holmes looked at the conductor with some irritation and replied:

"The problem is not where my ticket is.

The problem is, where am I going?"

Recognition of the need for intelligence concerning the intentions of our adversaries is as old as the nation itself. During the War of Independence General Washington observed:

The necessity of procuring good intelligence is apparent and need not be further urged -- all that remains for me to add is, that you keep the whole matter as secret as possible. For upon secrecy, success depends in most enterprises of the kind, and for the want of it, they are generally defeated, however well planned and promising a favorable issue.

During the first 165 years of our nation's history, however, we were able to exist behind the security of wide oceans and friendly borders and the need for intelligence was episodic. The world changed drastically for America on December 7, 1941 and, for better or worse, it will never again be the same.

The United States no longer enjoys the splendid isolation that its oceans and borders once provided and it must now exist in a world in which the minimum period of warning in the event of nuclear attack is less than 20 minutes.

As a result, we have today a national intelligence community made up of more scholars in the social and physical sciences than any campus can boast. It uses photography, electronics, acoustics and other technological marvels to gather facts from the four corners of the globe and inform the public, as we saw in the SALT debate, of the precise capabilities of weapons on the other side of the globe which the Soviets keep most secret.

George Washington, wherever he is, and people in other countries must find it puzzling that our Government permits any person, including an officer of an antagonistic intelligence service, to apply for documents from our intelligence records and demand lengthy legal justification if they are denied.

No other country in the world has a law which permits anyone anywhere in the world to poke into its intelligence files and I believe that an effective intelligence review cannot co-exist for long with the Freedom of Information Act as it now stands.

This does not represent a retreat from our Government's historic and cherished commitment to protecting essential liberties. But we should bear in mind, as Justice Goldberg once said, that "while the Constitution protects against invasions of individual rights, it is not a suicide pact."

Secrecy is essential to any intelligence organization. Ironically, secrecy is accepted without protest in many areas of our society. Physicians, lawyers, clergymen, grand juries, journalists, income tax returns, crop futures -- all have confidential aspects protected by law. Why should national security information be entitled to any less protection?

My highest responsibility as Director of Central Intelligence is to gather all relevant information, available from all sources, assess it, piece it together and arrive at national estimates relevant to decisions which face the President and the Congress on matters of national interest.

Policymakers used to get too many semantically papered over, homogenized intelligence estimates conveying only the conventional wisdom. To avoid this, CIA, military intelligence, and every other element of the Intelligence Community should not only be allowed to compete and surface differences, but be encouraged to do so. The way we work today, the chiefs of all our intelligence agencies -- State, CIA, Defense Intelligence Agency, Army, Navy, and Air Force Intelligence, FBI, Treasury, with its economic intelligence, and Energy, with its nuclear intelligence -- sit as a board of estimates and review national intelligence estimates. As Director of Central Intelligence, I am charged with formulating the estimate and I have the responsibility to see that all credible and substantiated alternative views are properly and fully reflected. These alternative views provide a range of estimates which help protect policymakers from the conventional wisdom.

This intelligence apparatus we have today should be especially significant to Americans living abroad.

Many of you, by virtue of living abroad, have special information and special perspectives which can contribute to the process. We have a specialized group of people charged with actively and openly developing this contribution.

Also, living abroad these days, you're on the firing line facing a propaganda barrage which paints the United States as the threat to the peace. How is it that there's more concern in Europe about 50 American military advisors working for a year to help the government of El Salvador defend itself than there is about Soviet and Polish military power moving in the dark of a single night to extinguish freedom in Poland?

Much of this war of words is based on a distorted and slanted view of the world and the forces at work in it. I remember talking to one of my predecessors, Dick Helms, some fifteen years ago before he became DCI, "When you sit here and read the reports that come through you realize how beleaguered this country really is". Those words still ring in my memory. It hasn't gotten any better.

We face not only military and terroristic threats but also intangible aggression from a skill in propaganda which continually puts us at a disadvantage. While American intelligence has shown the Soviets carrying off the biggest peacetime military buildup in history, deploying over 200 missiles targeted at Western Europe and using chemical and bacteriological weapons against women and children in Afghanistan and Indo-China, they have succeeded in painting the United States as the threat to peace.

This is accomplished through their political and intelligence apparatus in a far-flung and many-sided campaign of what they call active measures. Our intelligence must continue to identify the distortions of this propaganda and establish the truths to combat it.

If we look beyond Europe where a combination of these active measures and not too subtle intimidation seeks to divide us from our allies, we see the other continents of the world plagued and beleaguered by subversion and witch's brew of destabilization, terrorism and insurgency fueled by Soviet arms, Cuban manpower and Libyan money, with East Germany, North Korea, and the PLO chipping in special skills and experience. It's important to understand how all this works.

Beginning in 1974 and 1975, the Soviet Union undertook a new, much more aggressive strategy in the Third World. They found destabilization, subversion and the backing of insurgents in other countries around the world attractive and relatively risk free. Exploiting the availability first of Cuba and subsequently of other countries to serve as Soviet surrogates or proxies, they have been able to limit the political, economic and military cost of intervention.

In the aftermath of Vietnam, the Soviet Union soon began to test whether the U.S. would resist foreign-provoked and supported instability and insurgency elsewhere in the Third World. Fully aware of the political climate in this country, in the 1970s they developed an aggressive strategy in the Third World.

It avoided direct confrontation and instead exploited local and regional circumstances to take maximum advantage of Third Country forces (or surrogates) to attain Soviet objectives. This enables Moscow to deny involvement, to label such conflicts as internal, and to warn self-righteously against "outside interference." There is little disagreement among our analysts that Soviet and proxy successes in the mid-to late-70s in Angola, Ethiopia, Cambodia, Nicaragua and elsewhere have encouraged the Soviets to rely on and support the Cubans, Vietnamese and, recently, the Libyans ever more aggressively.

Over the last several years, the Soviets and their allies have supported, directly or indirectly, radical regimes or insurgencies in more than a dozen countries in every part of the Third World. The United States and its friends have had difficulty countering these insurgencies. It is much easier and much less expensive to support an insurgency than it is for us and our friends to resist one. It takes relatively few people and little support to disrupt the internal peace and economic stability of a small country.

It's truly remarkable the way the combination of money and manpower from two tiny countries, Cuba and Libya, with skills and arms provided by the Soviet Union and its satellites like Vietnam, North Korea, and East Germany, has terrorized four continents over the last ten years.

Subversion and terrorism destabilize existing governments. Insurgency is organized and supplied with weapons and experienced guerrilla leaders. Manpower is brought for training to Cuba, Lebanon, South Yemen, Bulgaria or

Libya, where terrorist training camps seem to make up the second largest industry next to oil.

Terrorism, the sophisticated terrorism of today, is big business and requires big money. Safehouses in safe areas, modern secure weapons, travel documents, transportation, etc., are very expensive. Terrorists need more than money. They require safe training sites, use of diplomatic bags, safe embassies, multiple travel documents, they need a country to back them. Qadhafi has been picking up a large slice of this and has attempted -- by act or by just leaks of an act -- to strike at senior American officials at home and abroad.

Cuba is the other worldwide troublemaker. For a nation of ten million people, Cuba has displayed a remarkable reach on a worldwide scale. It has 70,000 military and civilian advisors abroad in almost 30 countries. Of these, more than half are military. Over 40,000 are in Africa, and some 7,000 in the Middle East. There are 12,000 Cuban technical trainees working in Czechoslovakia and East Germany, and 5-6,000 studying in the Soviet Union.

How did this phenomenon develop? Part of it springs from the demographics -- the same source -- a combination of overpopulation and youth unemployment -- which gave us 150,000 Cuban refugees in the Mariel boat lift. Since 1980, there has been a surge in the 15-19 year old age group of 50 percent. Castro has admitted that tens of thousands of youths are out of work. They have lots of young men to train and send into other countries -- and that's the way to get preferment in government employment in Castro's Cuba.

The other source of Cuba's aggression is Soviet influence and support. The Soviets sell their weapons. Arms sales earn about 20 percent of their hard currency. Last year they gave Cuba four times the previous ten-year annual average.

In addition to free military equipment, the Soviet Union gives Cuba \$8 million a day, or \$3 billion a year, to keep its economy going. The Russians buy sugar at a premium and sell oil at a discount. There is no way that Cuba could play the role it does in Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East without this cash and military support from the Soviet Union. Moscow doesn't give away \$3 to \$4 billion a year unless they have a purpose.

Today Cuba sits astride the Caribbean with a modernized army of 150,000 troops, reserves of 100,000 and 200 Soviet MIGs. It now has the largest military establishment in the Western Hemisphere, save those of the U.S. and Brazil.

Cuba's recent combat experience in Angola and Ethiopia, together with its overwhelming qualitative and numerical superiority in weapons, provides it with a particularly ominous intervention capability in the Caribbean and Central America. This is clearly not the sole source of violence and instability in the Caribbean Basin, but it magnifies and internationalizes what would otherwise be local conflicts. Cuba's most immediate goals are to exploit and control the revolution in Nicaragua and to induce the overthrow of the governments of El Salvador and Guatemala. At the same time, the Cuban government is providing advice, safehaven, communications, training and some

financial support to several South American organizations. Training in Cuban camps has been provided in the last two years to groups from a dozen Latin American countries.

Today, we live in an extraordinarily challenging world. Protected though we may be by military might and economic strength, we are vulnerable without an effective intelligence service. We need it to help us judge the capabilities and intentions and monitor the activities of those with interests adverse to ours, to evaluate changing economic and political trends worldwide, and to anticipate danger before it threatens.

We live today in a world where the United States is being actively pressed to defend its role as the foremost economic and industrial power in the world. We now face competition from others in the free world, but we are still very much a great nation and power. Any country that can successfully engineer a feat like the flawless launch and recovery of the Columbia space shuttle has adequate resources and resolve to retain its position as leader of the free world. We all can take great pride in that magnificent achievement.

We nevertheless must recognize that we are now challenged as never before by military and commercial competitors of unprecedented strength. We can not rest on past achievements. We have permitted our own resources, both material and spiritual, to be drawn down. In the private sector, we have allowed an alarming decline in productivity and hence in our ability to compete in world markets. In the governmental sector, we have continually exhausted our reserves and then borrowed to cover the shortfall, compounding

the inflationary pressure on interest rates and sapping public confidence in the Government's ability to control expenditures.

These trends must not be allowed to continue. We can be thankful that we have found a leader who is determined to trim the fat, revitalize our institutions and reaffirm our will and purpose to work for peace and freedom.

-----0-----